



1 Plaintiff's 35th motion in this case, like many of the others before it, is meritless. He  
2 seeks leave to file a "revised" opposition to Alphabet and YouTube's Motion to Intervene, on the  
3 grounds that a video he cited in his original brief is no longer available on YouTube. Plaintiff  
4 requests an opportunity to submit a new brief that cites a different video, and/or attaches  
5 screenshots of the comments section from that video, in place of the one that was disabled. Dkt.  
6 148 (motion); *see also* Dkt. 144 ¶¶ 74-76 (opposition brief, citing to original video and comments  
7 that were disabled).

8 As an initial matter, we take issue with Plaintiff's accusation that YouTube's removal of  
9 the original link was "criminal" and done in an effort to hide something from the Court.  
10 YouTube disabled the link *at Plaintiff's request*, in response to his own DMCA takedown notice.  
11 His allegations of criminality and "sabotage" are baseless and irresponsible.

12 In addition, even though the link to the video he cited is no longer available, Plaintiff  
13 already copied and pasted excerpts from the link that he wanted the Court to see. *See* Dkt. 144 ¶  
14 76. There is no need for Plaintiff to file another brief for purposes of citing an additional link that  
15 contains the same type of content. His point is already made.

16 If, however, the Court is inclined to permit Plaintiff to file a revised opposition brief, the  
17 Court should make clear that Plaintiff is not permitted to use this as an opportunity to rewrite or  
18 expand upon his already-lengthy opposition. If anything, Plaintiff should only be permitted to  
19 supplement his brief for purposes of citing the new YouTube link that he refers to in his motion  
20 (Dkt. 148 ¶ 6) and nothing more. Plaintiff promises that he is "not simply requesting another go  
21 at the opposition just because I feel I could have done better[.]" *Id.* ¶ 15. The Court should hold  
22 him to that promise and not open the door for more procedural abuse.

23 Lastly, Plaintiff seeks leave to file a link to his Accidental Livestream under seal so the  
24 Court may use it to view the content at issue. Dkt. 148 ¶¶ 9-11. Alphabet and YouTube do not  
25 oppose this request. Indeed we encourage the Court to watch the video, as it demonstrates there  
26 was no creative authorship in it, as required for copyright protection.

1 Dated: May 23, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

2 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
3 Professional Corporation

4 By: s/ Jason Mollick

5 Jason Mollick (*pro hac vice*)  
6 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
7 New York, New York 10019  
8 Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
9 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899  
10 jmollick@wsgr.com

11 *Counsel for Intervenors*  
12 *Alphabet Inc. and YouTube, LLC*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28